



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11:0
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/558,711

11/29/2005

George Marmaropoulos

PHUS030143

7184

24737

7590

10/11/2007

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/558,711

Applicant(s)

MARMAROPOULOS ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5, 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bradbury 540 alone or taken with Bradbury 628.

2. For claim 1, Bradbury 540 luggage (figure 2) has interface at 15, 16, 17, 25, etc. and power source battery and battery charger, column 2, lines 40-50. Claims 2-5 clearly met by Bradbury 540. For these and all claims should issues arise as alternative recited features deemed obvious variations of the 540 device. For claim 7, note connector for external power at 42, 6. For claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, note antenna 31 mounted on a surface of the luggage and enabling use of wireless devices such as cell phone. This feature is both interface for cell phone and antenna. For claim 20, different type connections are at figure 2 and also formed by use of cell phone (no plug connection required). Claims 11, 14, 15, 8 are to features only disclosed schematically by applicant and that do not provide any new or unexpected result and are considered obvious variations. Bradbury 628 is incorporated into the 540 patent and is included since a part of the 540 disclosure and for claims 1, 8, 18 to more clearly depict battery and charger arrangements. Obvious to use these in the 540 device for compact arrangement. *with for claim 8, battery attached to case as in 628.*

3. Claims 11, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dalton, Olson, Gainor. *and Europe 689,298.*

Art Unit: 2839

4. Bradbury antenna is not an ink-like material on a surface of the luggage. Olson
Europe, antenna on leaf 15
at 70, Dalton at 16 and Gainor show antenna formed by lines considered ink-like and on
surface of objects. Obvious to so form Bradbury antenna as this would lessen
complexity of the device.

5. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would
be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base
claim and any intervening claims.

6. claim 19, is dependency correct?

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at
telephone number 571-272-2089

N. Abrams
NEIL ABRAMS
PRIMARY EXAMINER